

MACAULAY'S USE OF AUTHORITIES

79

the date of the entry referred to, and
Luttrell's Brief Historical Relation without it. There seems to
be quite a
chance whether he remembers to give an
exact reference
or not : no rule can be inferred from his
practice. Mr.
Andrew Lang commented on the subject as
follows :

Monsieur Henri Taine has elaborately traced
the methods
by which Macaulay made his History so
interesting, and
to be interesting is a very rare quality in an
English writer,
says the unprejudiced Frenchman, I think
that he over-
looks Macaulay's method of reference to his
authorities.
I open Macaulay at random, in volume I p.
309 (1866).
He has a footnote to the remark that, in 1685,
' it was not
thought by any means necessary that a divine
should be
able to read the Gospels in the original
Greek/ How does
he know that? I expect the footnote to give his
proofs with
volume and page. But Macaulay only says
that Roger
North tells us, that his brother John, a Greek
professor,
complained of the general neglect of Greek by
the acade-
mical clergy \ This is nearly as vague as
what Dr,
Johnson was once heard muttering to himself.
Pennant
tells us concerning bears . . / The public
likes the
vague. . . . For a fact about constitutional
etiquette Mac-
aulay offers this useful reference ' See
particularly Har-
rington's Oceana ' a work of oceanic
dimensions, into
which we are to dive without compass. Next
North's Life
of Guilford is cited in the vague. Barillon and

Burnet are quoted, sometimes with no more serviceable minuteness; and sometimes . . . when an important statement is made, there is actually no reference to any authority. At other times strings of references are given with laudable minuteness. It is much to be desired that an able editor should annotate the whole book in this manner even at the risk of making Macaulay uninteresting.¹

There is at present only one edition of Macaulay's History (in one volume, published in 1907) which attempts to

¹ Morning Post, Aug. 3, 1906.